

CHRISTIAN WORKER.

Published Every Month By

H. B. SHERRMAN, Editor and Publisher

MEAFORD, - - - ONTARIO.

J. C. WHITELAW, Business Manager,

To whom all Business Letters should be Addressed

SUBSCRIPTIONS, 30 CENTS PER ANNUM.

CHRISTIAN WORKER.

We are happy to report to our readers this month that the WORKER is receiving new subscribers at a rate which bids us hope for great good being done through it. We are reserving quite a number of January's issue to supply all new subscribers with the paper from the first of the year. We want some brother or sister in each congregation to solicit subscribers. We believe you cannot spend a few hours more profitably to the cause of Christ than by doing this. Who will be the next to respond? We want reports of success from your churches, but write short. We want the WORKER to be loaded down with news every month, so that we may rejoice together over our success. Your kind words of encouragement sent in are appreciated.—Editor.

OUR PLEA.

In laying our plea before our readers, we do not aim at novelty, nor claim originality for the thought, for it is what we as a people have been pleading for during these fifty years, but we want to tell it to you in plain simple language, stripped of generalities and lengthy quotations from others. In the plea for all to wear one name, many will find objections, no doubt. We often hear the statement, "it makes no difference about the name," yet it does make a difference even with themselves. If the speaker is a Methodist, ask him to be called a Baptist, for certainly you will not object if "it makes no difference about the name." By asking this question you will find that there is a difference about what name you wear. Human or man given names to designate one child of God from another are the greatest hindrances to Christian union we have to contend with. So in our plea for union we must present a basis against which no objection can be made. Having already intimated that no union can be affected on any sectarian name, we now approach the name about which there is no dispute. The name "Christian" is a name given by divine authority. "The Disciples were called Christians at Antioch," Acts, 11. 26. The original language conveys the idea, by divine authority. They were not called Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian by any authority—these names are of modern origin. The Apostle Peter fully recognizes the name "Christian" when he says "if any man suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed," 1st Peter, 4. 15. He does not say, if any man suffer as a High Churchman, Methodist, Baptist, Catholic, Presbyterian, &c., but "as a Christian." When Paul reasoned before King Agrippa so eloquently, Agrippa said, "almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," Acts 26. 28. If Paul had reasoned on the articles of faith and litany, infant baptism and the head of the church, being the ruling sovereign, Agrippa would have said, almost thou persuadest me to be a High Churchman, but it is quite easy to see how that the preaching of the apostles would persuade men to be Christians. This was the real object of their preaching—to make men Christians. How long do you suppose would take a man reading the

New Testament to learn that he ought to become a Baptist, Methodist, Christadelphian, Churchman, or a Sectarian in any sense? Now it is evident, that we cannot unite on any of the current sectarian names, for the Methodist will object to being called Baptist, and vice versa through the entire catalogue of sectarian names—hence no union is possible on either of these names. Let me now call all these good people together with all their man given names, their preachers being present. I request the preachers to call out their members that I may see how many they have. One calls out "Churchmen please stand here," every Churchman responds; another says, "Baptists stand here," and every Baptist responds; one says, "Methodists stand here," every Methodist responds; and so on until until you have five or six hundred groups with their preachers at their head. Why don't you all unite? Ah, the name divides you. I thought you said "there is nothing in a name." "Now why is this?" says the man of the world, "they all pretend to take the Bible—this looks bad." Just at this moment one who is standing by says, all Christians will please stand here, and they begin to respond by scores from every party. Why did you not all respond when the Methodist called? "because we do not agree on that name." Why do you all respond to the name "Christian"? "because there is no division on that name." Ah, well, then, we will just be content to be called simply "Christians." So there is union in that name. Now, sir, we say to the man of the world, "what do you think of this last name?" "Well, sir, this looks a little like union to me," he says, "but they will divide again." "Not as long as they hold on to the name 'Christian,' and refuse to be called by sectarian names. Christ, our loving Savior, is the Bridegroom; the church is the Bride; the Bridegroom has gone to prepare a mansion for his Bride; when He returns to take his Bride will He accept those who are wearing foreign names? And whose children will not wear the Bridegroom's name? It is hazardous to thus presume that He will accept them. O, when will the lovers of our blessed Savior be willing to humbly sit at His feet and be content to wear His name that divisions may cease.

TO THE DEACONS.

In the last number of the WORKER we wrote to the Bishop on the importance and responsibility of his office. In this number we want to talk to the Deacons of our churches. A great deal of our success must be attributed to the efficiency of our Deacons, and many failures can be traced to inefficient Deacons. While the Bishops have a constant oversight of the spiritual interests of the congregation, the Deacons should be as vigilant in the care of the temporal interests of the church. As you are aware, no doubt, your duty is to see that the emblems are properly prepared, to receive all the contributions, to pay out for the support of the worthy poor, and it is your duty to see that none of our poor are neglected—much of the honor of the church depends on this. When it is decided to pay a given amount for evangelizing it is your duty to see to it that the amount is paid promptly. You must remember that churches have characters as well as individuals. If they get into the habit of promising to pay so much and never redeem the promise, they will soon get this

reputation of dishonesty. You know full well that a dishonest church is a weak creature to invite men into from the world. The character of the church in this respect is very much what you make it; if you are diligent in your work there will be no just cause for blame on this score. There is a growing evil among us that ought to be corrected by the Deacons; I refer to the practice of a few paying all the expenses of the church. We want to reason with you awhile on this subject. I know you will reply to this that it is easier for us who are able to pay it off, than to spend the time to get the little from each one. It would be much easier and far less work for the teacher in your school to read the books and solve the problems, than to spend the time on the uneducated? but when will our children get an education in this way? Those who are not doing their part in paying the expenses, need to do it for their own benefit. All should be urged to do their part in this matter, that the full power of the church may be known. This work devolves largely upon your office. The fuel is to be procured, the meeting-house is to be kept clean, fires built, lamps trimmed, &c. It is the legitimate work of the Deacons to see to this, not to do it themselves, but to see that it is done by employing a man that will do it. Now my dear brother you can see that your office is far from being a nominal one, and that it is of the utmost importance. You will find many rough things to encounter ere you discharge your office faithfully for any great length of time. You will see at once how necessary it is for you to live humbly, honestly, and above reproach, in order to have the confidence and co-operation of all the members of the congregation, without which you must fail. Where the temporal affairs of the church are all properly looked after, other difficulties are not much to be feared. In conclusion, I would impress this one thought: it is not transacting a little business for the convenience of our brethren, but it is the Lord's business. That cannot be neglected without incurring His displeasure. You are His stewards, and you will be called upon "to give an account of your stewardship" to Him. You may encounter some hard work, 'tis true, but when you hear your Master say, "well done thou good and faithful servant," you will be glad that you did well and was faithful. All honor to our faithful and efficient Deacons.

SCATTERING AND INCREASES.

Now, you will find that liberal people are a happy people, and get more enjoyment out of what they have, than folks of a churlish mind. Misers never rest till they are put to bed with a shovell; they often get so wretched that they would hang themselves, only they grudge the expense of a rope. Generous souls are made happy by the happiness of others; the money they give to the poor buys them more pleasure than any other that they lay out. I have seen men of means give coppers, and they have been coppers in everything. They carried on a tin-pot business, lived like beggars and died like dogs. I have seen others give to the poor and to the cause of God by shovelfuls, and they have had it back by barrow-loads. They made good use of their stewardship, and the great Lord has trusted them with more, while the bells in their hearts have rung out merry-peals when they have thought of widows who blessed them, and orphan children who smiled in their faces.—From John Ploughman's Pictures.

TOBACCO—SOCIALLY.

Not only does tobacco injure those who indulge in it, bodily and mentally—but, from a social standpoint, it is an almost unsupportable evil. In the first place it is wholly unnecessary. Food is needful; exercise, rest, sleep, clothing, books, moderate amusements, rational pastimes, and for all these we must make dug and proper provision. But for tobacco we have no need. Not an organ requires it. The stomach needs food; the brain, sleep; thirst calls for drink; the body for raiment; but, from head to foot not a member, organ or function requires tobacco. In the second place, the use of tobacco is expensive. A good cigar costs ten cents; five or six a day is a moderate number for an habitual smoker; ten a day is a dollar a day wasted. Think of the "fun," to say nothing of the benefit which might be obtained for a dollar. There are many books which may be bought for a dollar. Think of the excursions and the weekly papers, and the books, and the presents to mother or sister, or young lady friends, and the pizza bits of bric-a-brac, and the tickets to museums, and the trips to the sea-shore, and the gifts to the really deserving poor, and the many other proper pleasures that are wrapped up in a dollar a day. In the third place, the use of tobacco is impolite. You will have to be very rude to use it in the company of ladies, or of others who do not smoke. The fact that many do smoke in the presence of ladies and others who do not smoke, and are tolerated, is no excuse for you. Because a hundred are ungentlemanly, is no reason why a hundred and one should be; and it is more to have the art of politeness than that of smoking, it seems to me. Another remark comes in just here appropriately. The amount of lying that the cigar gives rise to is very great. It is considered "proper" before a "gentleman" lights his weed in the company of a lady, or of any one who has declined to smoke, to say, "Is smoking objectionable to you?" And it is considered "proper" also, that the person addressed shall reply, "O, no." At any rate, nine times out of ten, persons do so, whether they really object or not. A great many falsehoods are in this way forced from people who have not the courage to say "yes." The right way is, if smoke is really unpleasant, or if you wish to discourage the habit, say plainly, but of course very politely, that you do object. No one would have the right after you told him that, to smoke where you were. Finally, the uncleanness of the habit should alone—even if there were nothing else against it—cause all nice persons to abstain from it. The idea of any man who expects any one to go with him, walk with him, take his arm, sit in the room with him, perfuming his clothes and person with an offensive odor. What would be said of a man who should carry a festida in his pocket? In fact, there are a hundred arguments against tobacco, and not one in its favor. Many say they will, or do, use it in moderation. Hardly one person in a thousand does that. It is hard to do so—so hard that a very small minority of tobacco users come anywhere near moderation. The best way is not to venture. If you never smoke one cigar a day, you will never smoke twenty. Some think it manly to smoke and chew. On the contrary, it is only manly, which is very different. Don't think that I have exhausted the subject, for I have not. I have given only the main points of the argument against the use of tobacco. I have spoken as a physician and as an observer in society. And I want to ask the boy who smokes, one question, and that is, if he smokes, why may not his mother or sister, and how would he like that? Would any man marry a woman who was a smoker or chewer? Now, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.—Dr. Deane, in Golden Days.

"WHERE IS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST?"

The above question has been discussed pro and con through the "Review" and "Old Path Guide" for a considerable time. At first I was like Sambo when asked "have you found the Lord?" He said, "Fo-de Lord; I did not know he was lost," but after reading on I was not so certain about it. When I read Bro. Rowe, I think "our fold" comprehends it all. When I read Bro. Allen, I change my mind and conclude that many sheep will be found among the goats. Brother Allen is very clever, when his side begins to weaken, he publishes some taffy that has been sent in by his admirers. But Bro. Rowe is not the man to be out-done in this, so he answers the taffy argument by dishing up an equal amount from his admirers. Now brethren, "let us be dismissed," as nothing but hair-splitting remains of the question.

STAYNER.

During our meeting at Collingwood last month, we adjourned our meeting two days, and I went to Stayner and spoke two evenings to good audiences. The brethren complained that their name had not appeared as a part of the "Georgian Bay Co-operation." It was the Secretary's fault in not notifying me. An editor is supposed to know everything, but now and then he does not. We had a splendid time while there, and want to go again. The church at Stayner is assisting in the work at Collingwood. So now when we speak of the "Georgian Bay Co-operation," we include Stayner.

"BOIL IT DOWN."

We say now, once for all, you must "boil down" your articles. Just take a look at the size of our paper, and you will not think of asking why. We have manuscripts from 3 to 11 pages of "foolscap" closely written. Too bulky even for our basket. "Boil it down." "Boil it down."

COMPLAINTS.

We have a nice long letter from a Bro. in Clinton, Ont., complaining, that advertisements are allowed to appear in the WORKER. The same complaint has been urged by several other brethren, some even hinting that the paper is published to assist some to increase their business, &c. We would just remind these brethren that it requires money to issue a paper. The printers must have cash every month for their work, ink and paper. It takes money to pay postage, wrappers, &c., and the question is, Where is this money to come from? No charge is made for the work of editing and management at present, and the advertisements are put in solely to assist in defraying actual outlay.

We now make the following reasonable offers. If some responsible brethren will guarantee to become responsible for any loss sustained in publishing, we will at once leave out the advertising. Or if our Bro. in Clinton, and others who complain, will send the 30c. asked for the paper, and assist in increasing the circulation until our list of subscribers is large enough to pay expenses, the advertisements will at once disappear. The above we think is fair, and just. Now let us hear from you, brethren, if you are in earnest. Send us your names as subscribers, with 30c. each, and send us a postal card stating that you will pay \$2, \$3, or \$5 if required to cover expenses should the subscription list not be sufficient. Now we will be pleased to hear from our readers on this question.—J. C. WERRICK.